

the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2830, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1126 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1126

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2830) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Homeland Security, and the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute

rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. In the engrossment of H.R. 2830, the Clerk shall—

- (a) add the text of H.R. 2399, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 2830;
- (b) conform the title of H.R. 2830 to reflect the addition to the engrossment of H.R. 2399;
- (c) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and
- (d) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

SEC. 3. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2830 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 4. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, on behalf of the Committee, to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 2830.

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1126 provides for consideration of H.R. 2830, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2008, under a structured rule. The rule

provides 1 hour of general debate, with 40 minutes controlled by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and 20 minutes controlled by the Committee on Homeland Security. The rule makes in order 15 of the amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee.

This rule also takes steps to prevent terrorist acts against our Nation by allowing for the text of H.R. 2399, the Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act, to be added upon House passage of the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act, and for the whole package to be sent over to our colleagues in the Senate. The Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act, which passed the House on May 22, 2007, by an overwhelming, bipartisan vote of 412-0, provides strong new enforcement tools at the border, including increased criminal penalties for alien smuggling, human trafficking and slavery, drug trafficking, and terrorism or espionage.

It also subjects smugglers and traffickers to even higher penalties for transporting persons under inhumane conditions, such as in an engine or storage compartment, or for causing serious bodily injury.

It directs the Department of Homeland Security to check against all available terrorist watch lists, alien smugglers, and smuggled individuals who are interdicted at the U.S. land, air and sea borders.

And it tightens proof requirements for distinguishing covert transportation of family members or others for humanitarian reasons for which the penalties are less severe.

Since the September 11, 2001, terrorists attacks, the Coast Guard has served as the primary agency responsible for our Nation's maritime security. The fact that the Coast Guard has risen to meet this heightened responsibility, while at the same time continuing to fulfill its nonsecurity missions, is a testament to the commitment and honor to the service men and women of the Coast Guard.

The bill that this rule provides for consideration will ensure that the Coast Guard can continue to perform all facets of its mission in an uncompromising way. H.R. 2830 provides the necessary resources by authorizing 1,500 additional Coast Guard personnel and increasing the funding to the Coast Guard by \$8.4 billion, \$200 billion over the President's request.

The underlying legislation sets requirements for security around vessels that transport, and facilities that process, liquefied natural gas, giving the Coast Guard the responsibility for enforcing security zones and requiring it to certify that State or local governments have the necessary resources before they can assist in security patrols around facilities. It also directs the Department of Homeland Security to analyze the threat of a terrorist attack on gasoline and chemical shipments and report to Congress.

H.R. 2830 will bolster port security and immigration enforcement by establishing an Assistant Commandant for Port and Waterways Security, authorizing additional maritime security teams and by establishing the Waterway Watch Program whereby civilian boaters can notify the Coast Guard of suspicious activity.

The Coast Guard Authorization Act enhances safety standards in one of America's most dangerous occupations—the one portrayed on the popular television series “The Deadliest Catch”—by increasing safety equipment requirements on fishing vessels, requiring training for vessel operations, and by changing the appeals process for suspending and revoking a mariner's license.

The bill also addresses one of the Coast Guard's Integrated Deepwater Systems Program, which has been beleaguered by several well-publicized delays, cost overruns, and problems with the designs of certain replacement assets. The bill increases accountability for the Deepwater Program by addressing systemic contract management problems and establishing a civilian chief acquisition officer reporting directly to the Coast Guard commandant.

H.R. 2830 also requires ships to begin installing water treatment systems to reduce the spread of invasive species in ballast water carried by the ships. These requirements are a step in the right direction because they will protect the waterways of every State and territory of the United States, and the industries and communities that rely upon them, from aquatic invasive species that enter the waters of the United States via the ballast water systems of commercial vessels. The bill also addresses other environmental concerns by requiring double hulls for U.S. ships carrying over 600 cubic meters of oil and providing for implementation of an international agreement on maritime pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation this rule provides for consideration is the product of extensive hearings and consideration by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Homeland Security Committee and the Judiciary Committee. I commend the chairmen and ranking members of those committees for their commitment to addressing the needs of the Coast Guard and our Nation's maritime security.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New York for yielding me the time for this important proposed rule for consideration of H.R. 2830, the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of 2008.

Unlike my colleague, I rise in opposition to the structured rule, and I would like to quote a colleague whose opinions on these matters I respect to explain why.

On September 15, 2005, my Democrat Rules Committee colleague from Flor-

ida, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, correctly stated that the modified open rule under which the Coast Guard was last reauthorized was insufficient in living up to how this House should be run.

While that Republican rule permitted Members who preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to offer those amendments, he noted his disappointment “that the preprinting of amendments was even required. Despite the majority's claim, this legislative process which they call open is actually restricted. It is not an open rule because every Member is not permitted to offer any germane amendment.”

Mr. Speaker, as imperfect and insufficient as that rule may have been to Mr. HASTINGS in 2005 and his minority Democrat colleagues, today's rule pales and fails in comparison—despite the often-repeated Democrat promises to run the most open, honest and ethical House in history.

This rule, which is even more restrictive, makes in order a majority of Democrat amendments and strips every Member with a new, good and germane idea of how to improve this legislation of the ability to come to the floor and even to offer it.

While the Democrats on the Rules Committee may have been following the wishes of their committee chairman by reporting out this rule, they have once again directly contradicted their campaign promises of their own leadership to run an open House of Representatives, instead choosing to become the most closed Congress in history.

Mr. Speaker, while this rule and this standard of recurring policy of closing down the legislative process is bad for the House, the effect of this legislation is even worse for American consumers. It continues the same flawed “no-energy energy policy” that Democrats have followed blindly for the last 17 months.

A provision included in this legislation would essentially shut down the development of new LNG plants which seem counterintuitive given today's energy crisis. Natural gas is one of the most clean-burning fossil fuels, and passing this provision would only further reduce our energy supply while moving us further from energy independence for which Republicans have consistently advocated.

Time and time again this Democrat leadership has consistently promised to deliver a “commonsense” energy plan to reduce the cost of gasoline. However, since my friends on the other side of the aisle have taken control of Congress, the average price of a gallon of gasoline has risen more than a dollar, from \$2.33 in January 2007 to just over \$3.51 this week.

I have supported a number of this Congress's bipartisan efforts to reduce demand—like legislation to increase CAFE standards. But Americans literally cannot afford for Congress to continue to ignore the supply-side

issues and problems associated with this overall issue. Specifically, that this Democrat majority continues to pursue a national energy policy that does absolutely nothing to increase our ability to produce more energy. Without a supply-side response, prices will continue to rise.

It is a fact that enough oil exists in deep waters off America's coasts and in our Federal lands to power 60 million cars for 60 years. Yet these domestic resources remain off-limits to exploration because of the Democrat policies that pervade this House.

In 1995, the Clinton administration vetoed the bill that would have allowed environmentally sound domestic exploration in Alaska. During this debate, opponents of the legislation argued that the benefits would be at least 10 years away and would not be worth it. Well, it is now more than 10 years later and the cost of crude oil has gone from just under \$20 a barrel to nearly \$120 a barrel and we are no closer to energy independence than we were 13 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I hope for the sake of American consumers, and for the sake of their paychecks, that it does not take this Democrat majority another 10 years to realize that now is the time that we should focus on ways to utilize our own energy resources. It is called energy independence.

For prices to fall, Congress should be considering legislation that increases supply and reduces demand, not legislation like today's, that simply reduces the supply of one of the planet's cleanest fossil fuels.

These are basic commonsense economic principles that should be part of a commonsense plan. I encourage all of my colleagues to recognize that now is the time to stop ignoring our untapped domestic supply. I oppose this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my friend from Dallas for his very thoughtful statement. He has made the case that we want to defeat the previous question on this so that any Member, Democrat or Republican alike, would have the opportunity to offer their thoughtful proposals as to how we would deal with this issue of skyrocketing gasoline prices.

I represent Southern California, and I will tell you that it is a major concern of my constituents. And I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as we have seen this dramatic increase take place over the past year plus, year and a half, agree it is very, very troubling.

□ 1415

And I was struck. I've had the benefit of looking at the advance copy of Mr. SESSIONS' closing remarks. His thoughtful staff has coined actually a

very, very apropos phrase here in describing what we have as the Pelosi Petroleum Price Increase—PPPI. And I think that really does coin it very well, because we know that 2 years ago tomorrow, Speaker PELOSI made this statement: “The Democrats have a commonsense plan to deal with skyrocketing gasoline prices.”

Now since that period of time, and I just was struck, I saw a cartoon in today's USA Today in which they go through this litany of proposals. We're telling Big Oil to make sure that they bring prices down, and proposals are thrown out in this cartoon, saying, Why don't we deal with the question of nuclear energy? Absolutely not.

Why don't we look at clean coal? Absolutely not.

Why don't we look at possibly responsible, environmentally sound exploration in ANWR? Absolutely not.

Why don't we look at using the cleanest, safest, most cost effective energy source, that being nuclear? We haven't built a nuclear power plant in 30 years. Absolutely not.

Why don't we increase our refinery capacity? There has not been a single new refinery built in 30 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of proposals that we very much hope we will be allowed to offer. The way to do that is to defeat the previous question on this rule so that we can say to our constituents, we are going to take firm, bold, dramatic steps to decrease the cost of the gasoline that they are putting in their cars every single day.

I thank my colleague for yielding. I thank him for his very thoughtful comments.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman. I believe that what the gentleman from California is saying is this: Is that we need supply-side answers to a problem when America needs the energy the most right now. And supply-side answers is what we would get if we defeat this rule.

We reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my friend from Texas for his comments.

I would just like to make two points in that regard. The first point is that he mentioned that this bill doesn't deal with the LNG issue. And I would beg to differ. This bill ensures that the Coast Guard will be there to ensure and protect the safety of our liquefied natural gas facilities that are built out in the deep water or out in the ocean. It's critical. Security is absolutely critical to these facilities, and that's exactly what this bill insures.

Secondly, my friend mentions that we have not done anything about energy. Well, I would respectfully say that anyone who says that, I would have to ask them where have they been for the past 16 months. We have done a great deal with respect to energy. The difference is that we haven't done anything to help large oil companies because we believe that they are part of the problem. We have done things to

help develop alternative energy, because that is the future of America. It's about making America less dependent on foreign oil and less dependent on the large oil companies. That's what we have done. That's what Democrats believe in, and that's what we will continue to do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to associate myself with his opening comments in regards to both the previous question as well as the rule. However, I'd like to speak to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2830, the Coast Guard Authorization Act. I believe this legislation is of tremendous importance for our magnificent Great Lakes actually because of title V which at long last provides for Federal regulations of ballast water in the lakes.

And why is this important? Because since the Great Lakes were opened to international shipping in the fifties and the sixties, many invasive species have entered the lakes through the untreated ballast water of the oceangoing freighters, also known as salties.

Let me just share with you some of these species and the problems that they have caused on the very delicate ecosystem of our Great Lakes.

The round goby was introduced to the Great Lakes in the late eighties through untreated ballast water. This fish is an aggressive and voracious feeder that can forage in total darkness. They can take over prime spawning grounds for native fish and upset the ecosystem. These unwanted invaders are flourishing in the Great Lakes and they are causing great damage, Mr. Speaker.

The ruffe entered the lakes in 1986 through untreated ballast water from Eurasia. This spiny perch is capable of explosive population growth that threatens native fish like walleye and pike, and their spiny gills make them very difficult for native predators to eat.

Another species, the spiny water flea, also entered the lakes around 1986 from its home in Great Britain and Northern Europe from untreated ballast water. These are actually not insects, but they're tiny crustaceans that have resource managers very worried because they compete for food directly with young native perch and other small fish. It also makes it very difficult for small fish to consume, so only larger fish can actually feed on them, again leading to explosive growth of this invasive species.

Another species, the zebra mussel, which was first discovered in 1988 and introduced into Lake St. Clair actually by the Caspian Sea, again from untreated ballast water. These species

have had a tremendously negative impact on recreational watercraft and drinking water intake pipes throughout Southeast Michigan, and now have spread throughout the entire Great Lakes.

In addition, they have filtered the water to such a degree that when combined with the historic low lake levels that we are currently experiencing, and increased nutrients in the water, it's led to very destructive and dangerous algae blooms throughout the lakes, which are causing beach closures and all kinds of other problems.

These unwanted species have cost State and local governments tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars to combat the damage that they have caused. And all of this is why I have been fighting for ballast water regulation since I came to the Congress, and why I worked very hard to see that it was included in this important legislation.

The passage of this legislation will place new requirements on oceangoing vessels entering the Great Lakes. Vessels operating in United States waters will be required to operate ballast water treatment systems that meet interim standards beginning next year, and more stringent standards will take effect in the year 2012.

Until ballast water treatment systems are installed, vessels bound for United States ports must exchange their ballast water and perform salt water flushing.

And States like my State of Michigan, which have grown tired of waiting for Federal action, and have actually initiated their own ballast requirements, will be able to operate our own programs until the final Federal standards do take effect.

I certainly want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Ranking Member MICA for their leadership on this issue. Again, I oppose this rule; however, I do support the underlying legislation. I think it is long past time to act on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the Coast Guard Authorization piece of legislation that will greatly assist in protection of a great national treasure, our magnificent Great Lakes.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with and concur with the comments of my colleague, the gentlelady from Michigan, regarding the merits of the bill. I'm pleased to serve on Transportation and Infrastructure, and I'm happy to say that Chairman OBERSTAR always goes the extra mile to incorporate everybody's opinions from both sides. And I believe this is a good bill that deserves all of our support.

Regarding the allegations or the comments that are being made about this Congress not being interested in or producing bills that will produce energy, I beg to differ.

H.R. 2264, holding OPEC accountable for oil price fixing, we call it the NOPEC Act, which was passed on May 27 of last year, with 220 Democrats voting for it, and 125 Republicans voting against it.

Cracking down on gas price gouging, H.R. 1252, passed May 23 of last year, opposed by 140 Republicans, including all of the Republican leadership, 228 Democrats voting in favor of it.

Repealing those subsidies that were given to profit-rich big oil companies. We're talking about ExxonMobil and the other big oil companies that have made the biggest profits of the history of any industry in the world. And, by the way, the five CEOs of the five biggest oil companies testified a couple of weeks ago before the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. I sat there while all five of them talked about how they couldn't help it they were making so much money. One of my colleagues from the Republican side during his 5 minutes of questioning, Representative WALDEN, said, "I'm a small businessman"—and if I can paraphrase because I don't know if this is an exact quote—"I'm a capitalist," said Representative WALDEN. "And when I had a very good year where my profit is so high that it's better than I even could have imagined, I start to ask whether I can lower the prices to my consumers."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HALL of New York. "I start to think," said Representative WALDEN to the oil company executives, "about whether I might be able to lower the price at the pump and lower the price to my consumers. Have you ever thought about doing that, now that you're making such a big profit?"

And one by one, all five of them said, "Oh, we don't control the price at the pump."

I think that's as good a case as one needs to hear for government regulation and possible legislation to make sure that there are not excess profits or gouging going on in this current state of the economy, and especially the oil economy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

It's unfortunate that we're here today to consider an important piece of legislation, our Coast Guard reauthorization, and it's also unfortunate we're discussing the rule under which that legislation will be brought to the floor, and that's a closed rule.

Unfortunately, this is the first time in at least 20 years that this Coast Guard reauthorization has been considered under a closed rule, not an open rule. I think it's particularly unfortunate that this year, when the Demo-

crat leadership has chosen to restrict debate on this important legislation that has a number of important provisions, including a provision to provide a transportation worker identification card and straighten out some of the problems we've had in trying to get a single transportation worker identification card at our ports and other facilities that we can use.

I had an amendment that would have allowed my State of Florida, and other States, a simpler method of obtaining an FBI background check on port workers than is currently available. It would also have saved port workers the cost of paying for the same background check twice.

I brought here the TWIC card. We've been waiting since 2002 for this TWIC card, Federal card. We still don't have this card. In fact, the irony of this is they allowed several amendments; one to allow any identification, there's going to be an amendment that's put in order. I can use my driver's license in the interim.

Then there's another amendment that they allowed to allow them to enroll for a TWIC card 24/7. The ironies of not allowing something to have a State, again, work with the Federal Government and even go beyond the requirements like Florida does in trying to look at the background, the criminal background of the individual. So that's been eliminated, and my opportunity to present that, from this rule and consideration of this legislation.

Also, I'm going to take great exception with this bill because of some other restrictions they put on. Bringing in liquefied natural gas. Natural gas prices are soaring. Prices are high, and this bill creates more red tape, more impediments, and actually will reduce the supply and increase the cost to the consumer out there who's trying to pay those expensive bills for energy.

So this bill does nothing for energy. And it takes a trusted port worker, transportation worker card and makes a continual farce out of the whole process, and not allowing a reasonable relationship between the State and Federal Government.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. Every day the valiant men and women of the United States Coast Guard save lives and protect the welfare of our great country. And every day the Coast Guard lives its motto and stands always ready to help those in need.

□ 1430

Since the devastating attacks of September 11, 2001, the Coast Guard has taken on the enhancement role in homeland security. Yet the President has consistently submitted budgets that fail to give the Coast Guard adequate resources to execute all its missions. Now it's our turn to help them.

The legislation to be considered today, H.R. 2830, funds the Coast Guard at \$8.4 billion, \$200 million over the President's budget. It also increases the Coast Guard in strength to 47,000 by adding 1,500 new members. The bill authorizes additional maritime security response teams to provide anti-terrorism protection for strategic shipping, high-interest vessels, and other critical infrastructure. These teams are the Coast Guard's quick response force. They can be deployed rapidly anywhere in the Nation via air, ground, or sea to respond to changing threat conditions.

H.R. 2830, Mr. Speaker, also authorizes additional K-9 detection teams to detect explosives, drugs, and smuggled persons.

Additionally, this bill authorizes the Waterway Watch program, a nationwide initiative modeled after Neighborhood Watch programs, to allow fishermen, recreational boaters, and others who work or play on American waterways to notify the Coast Guard of suspicious activities.

Since 9/11, the Coast Guard has struggled to develop much-needed port security regulations, including those mandated by the Safe Ports Act, such as long-range vessel tracking and enhanced crew member identification. H.R. 2830 address this critical gap and others by creating a dedicated assistant commandant for port and waterway security to oversee port security measures.

With respect to liquefied gas terminals, the bill requires the Coast Guard to protect and enforce the security zones around all existing LNG facilities. Admiral Allen himself has acknowledged, Mr. Speaker, to Congress that when it comes to the proliferation of LNG facilities, he doesn't have the resources necessary to fulfill the Coast Guard's port security responsibilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. That allows, Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard to partner with the State and local entities to protect the security zones around LNG facilities.

Last, and certainly not least, Mr. Speaker, the improvements that the bill makes in the Deepwater program. In the future, there will be contract managers at the Coast Guard that know their job and never again will the Coast Guard be in the absurd position of accepting boats that don't float.

I urge a "yes" on the rule and on the underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member, Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, as an environmentalist and a protector of our Great Lakes, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2830's ballast water management requirements and its stated goal of eliminating aquatic invasive species from our waters.

Ballast water management and the broader issue of aquatic invasive species is a matter that has received far too little attention, given its dramatic impact on the economy and the environment.

For several years, I have strongly supported a comprehensive approach to stopping the influx of aquatic invasive species, and this bill provides a very, very good start.

Although aquatic invasive species enter into ecosystems through many different pathways, such as natural migration, attaching themselves to ships, and aquaculture, the most common pathway is through ballast water. Ballast water is pumped on board a ship to control its stability at sea. Ships often take on ballast water at an initial port and discharge it at their destination port. When a ship pumps harbor water into its ballast tanks, it usually also sucks up aquatic species from that harbor. When those ballast tanks are emptied, those aquatic species are introduced into a new ecosystem and they become invasive species.

Since some ships are capable of holding millions of gallons of ballast water, the potential for spreading invasive species is large. Once an invasive species takes hold in a new environment, it has the ability to disrupt the balance of an ecosystem and cause significant environmental and economic harm.

In the United States, invasive species cost tens of billion of dollars each year. For example, Zebra mussels have cost the various entities in the Great Lake's basin an estimated \$5 billion for expenses relating to cleaning water intake pipes, purchasing filtration equipment and so forth. Sea lamprey control measures in the Great Lakes cost approximately \$10 million to \$15 million annually. And on top of these expenses, there is the cost of lost fisheries due to these invaders. For these reasons, combating aquatic invasive species is a central element of the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration strategy to protect and restore the Great Lakes.

However, invasive species are not just a problem in the Great Lakes. Invasive species also affect coastal regions throughout the United States. From the Chinese mitten crabs in the North Pacific, to Asian sea squirts in New England, to New Zealand boring pill bugs in the Pacific Northwest, to Asian carp in the Mississippi River, to Zebra mussels across the United States, these foreign invaders cause significant economic and ecological damage throughout North America.

If we do not pass this bill into law, we are just opening the door for many more invasive species to arrive via ballast water. The goal of H.R. 2830 is to eliminate invasive species in ballast water by 2015. To meet this goal, the bill requires vessels operating in U.S. waters to be outfitted with ballast water treatment systems that meet interim standards starting in 2009, with more stringent standards starting in 2012.

This is an excellent bill. I urge everyone to support it and vote for it.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1126 which provides a rule for the consideration of H.R. 2830 and makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The base text of H.R. 2830, which was ordered to be reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in June 2007, already includes many significant provisions to strengthen the Coast Guard and respond to challenges we face in maritime transportation. For example, the bill, as reported, includes standards to prevent the continued introduction of invasive species in U.S. waters through ballast water. The bill creates an ombudsman in each Coast Guard district to serve as a liaison between the Coast Guard and the port community. And the bill introduces critical measures to improve the safety of the United States fishing industry, one of our Nation's deadliest professions.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute adds critical titles that address specific issues considered by the Committee on Transportation and the Coast Guard Subcommittee after the bill was reported. Specifically, the amendment includes titles that strengthen both the Coast Guard's homeland security functions and its maritime safety missions. The amendment in the nature of a substitute also transfers the appeals of cases in which the Coast Guard decides to spend or revoke a mariner's credential to a neutral agency, the National Transportation Safety Board.

Further, the amendment includes the text of H.R. 2722, the Integrated Deepwater Program Reform Act which previously passed the House by a vote of 426-0 and which would strengthen the Coast Guard's ability to manage the \$24 billion, 25-year Deepwater procurements.

Similarly, the amendment includes the text of the Maritime Pollution Prevention Act to reduce emissions from ships. This measure also previously passed the House. Adoption of H. Res. 1126 would enable the House to consider long-overdue legislation to authorize the Coast Guard and to strengthen our U.S. maritime industry, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the favorite son from North Carolina, the gentleman, Mr. COBLE.

Mr. COBLE. I thank my friend from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. We in the Congress cannot lose sight of the purpose of Deepwater, which is to pro-

vide the men and women of the Coast Guard with the necessary tools to protect our homeland. I applaud actions undertaken to move this program in the right direction and support this language. I remain concerned, however, that some provisions in H.R. 2830 may create undue burdens and delays, which will, in turn, delay the desperately needed modernization and may ultimately add to the overall costs.

The marine safety components of the underlying bill also cause me concern. Previously, the Commandant announced a number of changes he had directed the Coast Guard to implement regarding marine safety. Under his leadership, his able leadership, I might add, the men and women of the Coast Guard continue to examine and improve upon the Coast Guard's marine safety role.

Having served in the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, I know this armed service is unique because of its structure and flexibility. On a daily basis, Coast Guard men and women focus on drug interdiction, environmental protection, migrant interdiction, port security, search and rescue, homeland security, maritime safety, and aids to navigation. The list is almost endless. Each of these roles complements the other.

I continue to support efforts to provide stakeholders an opportunity to voice their concerns, provide constructive feedback, and work together to improve the marine safety aspect of the Coast Guard. At the same time, however, I firmly believe that we should give the Coast Guard the time, opportunity, and resources to improve and expand on its marine safety efforts prior to congressional intervention.

I'm equally concerned regarding the underlying bill which lacks provisions that would provide the Coast Guard the authority to protect seafarers who facilitate the government's ability to investigate and prosecute environmental crimes. This is another example where current law impedes our ability to prosecute criminals.

I would also like to express my concern with section 720 of the underlying bill which addresses security at liquefied natural gas facilities. Consistently, I have cast votes in favor of legislation which I believe will help to make our Nation energy independent. While there has not been focused attention on LNG, it remains a viable energy alternative. Therefore, I'm concerned by provisions that would designate the Coast Guard as the sole agency responsible for LNG security.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to H.R. 2830, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2007.

I'd like to first comment on provisions in the underlying bill which affect the Deepwater program. We in Congress cannot lose sight of the purpose of Deepwater, which is to provide the men and women of the Coast Guard with the necessary tools to protect our homeland. I applaud actions undertaken to move this program in the right direction and support this

language. I remain concerned, however, that some provisions in H.R. 2830 may create undue burdens and delays which in turn will delay this desperately needed modernization and may ultimately add to the overall costs.

The marine safety components of the underlying bill also cause me concern. Previously, the Commandant announced a number of changes he had directed the Coast Guard to implement regarding marine safety. Under his leadership, the men and women of the Coast Guard continue to examine and improve upon the Coast Guard's marine safety role.

Having served in the Coast Guard and Reserve, I know the armed service is unique because of its structure and flexibility. On a daily basis, Coast Guard men and women focus on drug interdiction, environmental protection, migrant interdiction, port security, search and rescue, homeland security, and maritime safety. Each of these roles, in my opinion, complements the others.

I continue to support efforts to provide stakeholders an opportunity to voice their concerns, provide constructive feedback, and work together to improve the marine safety aspect of the Coast Guard. At the same time, I firmly believe that we should give the Coast Guard the time, opportunity, and resources to improve and expand upon its marine safety efforts prior to congressional intervention.

I am equally concerned the underlying bill lacks provisions that would provide the Coast Guard the authority to protect seafarers who facilitate the Government's ability to investigate and prosecute environmental crimes. This is another example where current law impedes our ability to prosecute criminals.

I'd also like to express my concern with section 720 of the underlying bill which addresses security at liquefied natural gas facilities. Consistently, I have cast votes in favor of legislation which I believe will help to make our Nation energy independent. While there has not been focused attention on LNG, it remains a viable energy alternative. Therefore, I'm concerned by provisions that would designate the Coast Guard as the sole agency responsible for LNG security. In my opinion, this is neither reasonable nor practicable for the Coast Guard or the communities where these facilities currently exist. In my opinion, this provision will act as a barrier to entry for future facilities and result in higher energy prices for consumers. Later today or tomorrow, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting an amendment made in order which would strike this dangerous provision.

Finally, I'd like to address the inclusion of H.R. 2399, the Alien Smuggling and Terrorism Prevention Act. It is my understanding that upon engrossment of H.R. 2830, this language will be included in the underlying bill. I support this action as maritime alien smuggling has become a business where smugglers game the system and have little to lose under the current law. The Coast Guard confronts smugglers on a routine basis who know they can use a lack of authority to their advantage. These kinds of cases are dangerous to our Coast Guard men and women and dangerous to the smuggled aliens and occur at increasing frequency.

This measure is necessary because it provides a tool for the Coast Guard and Department of Justice to ensure the integrity of our maritime borders. Currently, there are enormous procedural and jurisdictional hurdles that

protect and actually embolden alien smugglers. It will begin to deter unsafe and inhumane sea-based smuggling by delivering enhanced consequences to those who flee from or lie to our Federal law enforcement officers. Later today or tomorrow, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Representative LAMAR SMITH, will offer an amendment to clarify this authority. While I support the underlying measure, I believe the Smith amendment augments this provision and merits adoption.

It is my hope that during the amendment process some of my concerns in the underlying bill will be alleviated, but as we speak I cannot support passage of H.R. 2830. That said, I look forward to working with my colleagues as this process moves forward.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy Independence, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, from 1995 until 2006, the Republican Party controlled the House of Representatives, and since January of 2001, they've controlled the White House as well. During this period, the leadership of the Republican Party in the Congress and in the White House have pumped literally billions of dollars of unnecessary subsidies into the pockets of Big Oil, tens of billions of dollars.

They voted for royalty-free drilling for the biggest oil companies on offshore public lands. They've opposed all efforts to repeal billions in tax breaks for Big Oil. And in the 12 years they controlled the Congress up until the beginning of last year, they opposed high fuel economy standards for the vehicles which we drive in America so we could back out that oil that we import from the Persian Gulf.

GOP used to stand for "Grand Old Party," but now it stands for "Gas and Oil Party."

□ 1445

Here's what the President said about giving incentives to Big Oil in 2005. He said, "I will tell you, with \$55 oil, we don't need incentives for the oil and gas companies to explore. There are plenty of incentives for the oil industry." That's George Bush, April 2005 at \$55 a barrel. Today, it's at \$119 a barrel. But the Republicans, you know, they just can't kick a bad habit. Offering subsidies to Big Oil to drill is like subsidizing fish to swim, you just don't need to do it. They have all the incentives which they need right now. So the Democratic Party, assuming office just a year ago, under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI, she said, we're going to put a stop-payment order on these unnecessary subsidies to Big Oil.

Last December, we passed the first increase in fuel efficiency standards in 35 years, increasing it to 35 miles per gallon by 2020. We increased the renewable fuel standard to 36 billion gallons, but the Republican opposition made it impossible for us to take the \$18 billion in excessive and unnecessary tax

breaks away from the oil company and to transfer it to the solar and to the wind and to the renewable energy industry. So we're taking that bill up again this year. The Republicans oppose it. They're saying, keep the tax breaks for Big Oil. Keep them away from the wind and the solar industry.

They have no solutions for the 21st century. They have no plan to wean America off of this increased oil dependency. We have gone up from 27 percent dependency to 61 percent dependency upon imported oil in just the last 20 years. This Republican policy is going to make us less secure, more financially dependent upon the Middle East, and it is going to cause an economic and national security catastrophe for our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman made his point: Since the Democrat Party has taken over, prices at the pump have skyrocketed.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. This has been an interesting discussion. Oil prices record high, \$119, gas prices, \$11. And is Congress acting? What is on the table here to help Americans for affordable energy? Very little, folks. We're about restricting supply.

Consumers are paying the highest prices. The people in my district, and I'm sure in yours, are struggling to drive long distances. I come from a rural district. People are paying \$20 and \$30 a day to drive to work. They can't afford that. They're struggling now to catch up with their winter heating bills, which were unreasonably high.

Well, who's the bad guy? Who's causing this price rise? Mr. MARKEY from Massachusetts said it's Big Oil because they just charge too much. He also says it's because we're putting 70,000 barrels a day in the SPR. Well, why are oil prices high, folks? It's because this Congress, three decades ago, locked up supply. Look at the red on the map. That's the Outer Continental Shelf. We're the only country in the world who doesn't produce gas and oil there. The only country in the world. There are huge reserves in the Midwest.

This body and the Democrat Party have been talking about locking up the shale rock, there's been legislation to do that, the Roan Plateau, the best gas reserve in the Midwest, locking them up.

They talk about us not being dependent on foreign energy, but everything they're doing makes us dependent on foreign energy, where we have no control. Yes, prices for energy are set on Wall Street. Right or wrong, that's the system. They set the prices. When you lock up supply, if we stopped growing as much corn, prices go up. If you stop making as much steel in this country,

if you limit, steel prices are going to go up. We're limiting the production of energy.

Are we against wind and solar? Absolutely not. Look at the chart here. Here's the renewables. They think that's going to be an instant answer. I want all the wind we can get, all the solar we can get, all the geothermal. We're promoting biofuels. On the biofuels issue, we mandated 35.5 billion gallons a year by 2030. We had 6.5 billion gallons last year.

Corn prices have tripled. Wheat prices have tripled. Food prices are getting so people now are struggling to go to the grocery store after they've been to the gas station. If we have a bad crop failure down the road, not only are food prices going to go crazy, but ethanol prices. Folks, I think we better be very careful about the biofuels. I'm not opposing them, I never have, but I would be surprised if biofuels can increase the use of gasoline we need in growth. Energy prices, folks, are dependent on supply. If we double wind and solar tomorrow, we're at less than three-quarters of 1 percent of our energy supply. I hope we can do it.

Folks, we need to produce energy so Americans can afford to live.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, one point that I would like to make at this time is that the gentleman talks about oil and talks about energy, but the thing that he fails to point out is that gas and oil are limited, they are not going to be there forever. We need to stop our reliance upon fossil fuels, upon gas and oil, and start to focus on renewable alternative energy and become less dependent on foreign oil, less reliant upon fossil fuels.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I would like to associate myself with the comments of Mrs. MILLER and Mr. EHLERS from the other side as they talked about this very important Coast Guard bill. I am from the Great Lakes State. In fact, I have more shoreline than any other congressional district in the continental United States. I have over 1,600 miles of shoreline on the Great Lakes. It is critically important that we pass this Coast Guard bill.

But on this point, my colleagues on the other side use a very important bill like the Coast Guard bill to talk about energy, that somehow Democrats are not doing enough and somehow the Speaker is responsible for high oil prices. If you take a look, the Republicans have been in charge, until last year, for the last 12 years. What was their policy? Their policy has been no policy, do nothing, let the oil companies get away with it, record profits, record pensions to their CEO. Remember the \$400 million pension for ExxonMobil?

I guess I agree with Mr. PETERSON, the last speaker, maybe we ought to lock them up. We ought to lock them up when you see oil prices, when President Bush comes in, at \$27 a barrel, we're up to \$119. And where is it going to stop? Why do you see this rapid increase? Well, an ill-advised war where everybody said when you get involved in a war in the Middle East, the longer you're there, the prices are going to go up. When you have no policy, sure oil prices are going to go up. When you pass, as the Republican Party did, the Enron loophole which allowed speculators to come into the market and drive up the price of oil, you're going to get these criminal record prices we're paying. So Mr. PETERSON is right, we should lock them up. We should lock them all up.

What have the Democrats done? Well, we've passed price gouging legislation, not once, but twice. And most of my friends on this side of the aisle, like Mr. SESSIONS and others who spoke here today, voted against it. How about the PUMP Act, Prevent the Unfair Manipulation of Prices. We have that legislation, all sponsored mostly by Democrats. I think we had two brave Republicans who came forward to help sponsor it.

So what do we have here? You talk about refinery capacity. I'm chairman of Oversight and Investigations. A 1995 memo from the American Petroleum Institute to all the big oil companies was to say, shut down the refineries. You want record prices? Shut down the refineries. We have those memos. They're part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And what did they do? Between 1995 and 2002 they shut down over 30 refineries, including one just outside my district in Alma, Michigan, which used to refine 51,000 barrels a day, that's over 1 million gallons of gas, because there's 33 gallons of gas in every barrel of oil, they shut it down to increase the price so they could have their record profits, so they can pay their CEO a \$400 million pension plan, so they can have \$40 billion in profits, as we saw with ExxonMobil just last year.

Democrats have been in charge now for, what, 16 months? What have we done?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. STUPAK. We've passed energy price gouging legislation. We have a PUMP Act to take the speculators and close the Enron loophole. We've passed the renewable portfolio standard.

We are moving forward. And we ask our friends on this side of the aisle to join us, not use a good bill like the Coast Guard bill to somehow say the Speaker is responsible. It was the President of the United States who said he would jawbone the Saudis to produce more oil to bring down our prices. He jawboned them all right,

they jawboned right through to our pocketbook, with record prices at the pump, record prices of oil coming into this country.

Pass the PUMP Act. We can reduce the price of oil by \$30 a barrel, as testified on December 12, 2007 by experts before our committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee. Stop the unfair manipulation of prices. Lower the price of oil. Give the American taxpayers relief. And pass the Coast Guard bill to clean up our environment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS).

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. I would like to thank my friend from Texas for recognizing me.

I would like to thank my colleague down on the floor, who is just taking the chart down now. His chart actually makes a very good point, the price of oil has doubled in the last year. I hope they use that chart often.

The issue that's facing the American people right now is our dependence on foreign oil and our gas prices. Energy is the foundation and the lifeblood of the American economy, creating the conditions that help us support good-paying jobs here in the United States and allowing our industrial base to compete with the rest of the world.

We all know that middle class families, such as those that I represent in northeast Tennessee, are feeling significant pain at the pump. But the American family isn't the only place where the strains of spiking fuel prices can be felt. According to the recent news reports, local schools, law enforcement agencies and other community services are paying the price of these record-high oil prices.

Unfortunately, Democrats in the House have been consistent in offering so-called energy legislation that weakens our ability to compete with emerging titans such as China, India and Russia. In the United States today, we're 63 percent dependent on foreign sources of oil, and that percentage is growing ever year. Gasoline prices have increased more than \$1 per gallon since the majority took control of the House last year, as the last chart indicated, increasing from a nationwide average of \$2.33 per gallon on the first day of the 110th Congress to now well over \$3.50 per gallon.

Not only has the majority party failed to end our reliance on Middle Eastern oil for essential energy, they have actually helped grow our independence to historic and dangerous new levels all because of their refusal to allow for responsible energy production here at home. We need to use American energy.

What we need is no more excuses. We need an energy policy that allows for the use of American energy now. We need to drill for oil in ANWR and off the Outer Continental Shelf. We need to use our abundant coal supplies through clean coal technology. We

need to create safe nuclear power plants. We need to build new refineries. And we need to expand green energy, yes, green energy initiatives, like switch grass, wind power, solar power, hydroelectric power.

We cannot tax and regulate ourselves into prosperity, and that's exactly the energy policies that have come out of this Congress. You cannot tax and regulate yourself into prosperity. We have to have an energy policy that actually has energy.

The American middle class deserves better. They deserve an energy policy that is dependent on American energy, not foreign energy. Therefore, I recommend a "no" vote on the rule on the floor today so we can continue to talk about what is important to the American people, lowering the cost of energy.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

While I associate myself positively with the remarks on energy, I rise for a different reason in opposition to this rule.

We have been battling with the Coast Guard and their budget submissions from OMB as to why narcotics are not considered part of their terrorism mission. We have made some progress with that, but I had an amendment submitted to reflect that drug interdiction is a homeland security mission as required under the Homeland Security Act. I do not understand why jurisdictional disputes would have stopped this. Both committees, Transportation and Homeland Security, should agree that it's part of terrorism, and both committees need to work on narcotics and make sure, because smugglers are smugglers, whether they're smuggling people or whether they're smuggling contraband. And if we get this mission separated, since every single person in the Coast Guard says their first concern is homeland security, what we wind up is neglecting the narcotics mission.

My friend from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and I have worked on the narcotics issue for a long time. And I would hope that petty jurisdictions in the House wouldn't stop us from moving ahead in a bipartisan way to make sure that narcotics are part of the terrorism mission. I hope this is fixed in any conference report.

□ 1500

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from New York does not have any additional speakers at this time. We have no further speakers on our side.

Mr. ARCURI. That is correct. I do not have any additional speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute re-

maining. The gentleman from New York has 7 minutes remaining.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 57, nays 345, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—57

Akin	Fallin	Murphy, Patrick
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Pearce
Barton (TX)	Goode	Petri
Berry	Hobson	Regula
Bilbray	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Johnson (IL)	Renzi
Bishop (UT)	Johnson, Sam	Schwartz
Blackburn	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Brady (TX)	King (IA)	Sessions
Broun (GA)	LaHood	Souder
Cardoza	Lamborn	Stearns
Chandler	Linder	Sullivan
Conaway	Lungren, Daniel	Tancred
Cubin	E.	Tiahrt
Davis, David	Mack	Walberg
Davis, Lincoln	Marchant	Weldon (FL)
Deal (GA)	McCauley (TX)	Westmoreland
Doolittle	McIntyre	Young (AK)
Duncan	Mica	
Emerson	Miller, Gary	

NAYS—345

Abercrombie	Castor	Foster
Ackerman	Chabot	Fox
Aderholt	Clarke	Frank (MA)
Alexander	Clay	Franks (AZ)
Allen	Cleaver	Frelinghuysen
Altmire	Coble	Gallely
Arcuri	Cohen	Garrett (NJ)
Baca	Conyers	Gerlach
Bachmann	Costa	Giffords
Bachus	Costello	Gilchrest
Baird	Courtney	Gillibrand
Baldwin	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Barrett (SC)	Crowley	Gonzalez
Barrow	Cuellar	Goodlatte
Bean	Culberson	Gordon
Becerra	Cummings	Graves
Berkley	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Berman	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Biggart	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Tom	Hall (NY)
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hare
Bonner	DeGette	Harman
Bono Mack	Delahunt	Hastings (FL)
Boozman	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Boren	Dent	Hayes
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, L.	Heller
Boucher	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hensarling
Boustany	Dicks	Herge
Boyd (FL)	Dingell	Herseth Sandlin
Boyd (KS)	Donnelly	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Hill
Braley (IA)	Drake	Hinchey
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Hinojosa
Brown, Corrine	Edwards	Hirono
Buchanan	Ehlers	Hodes
Burgess	Ellison	Holden
Burton (IN)	Ellsworth	Holt
Butterfield	Emanuel	Honda
Buyer	Engel	Hooley
Calvert	English (PA)	Hoyer
Camp (MI)	Eshoo	Hunter
Cannon	Everett	Inglis (SC)
Capito	Fattah	Inslee
Capps	Ferguson	Israel
Capuano	Filner	Issa
Carnahan	Flake	Jackson (IL)
Carney	Forbes	Jackson-Lee
Carson	Fortenberry	(TX)
Castle	Fossella	Jefferson

Johnson (GA)	Moran (KS)	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Moran (VA)	Sestak
Jones (NC)	Murphy (CT)	Shadegg
Jordan	Murphy, Tim	Shays
Kagen	Murtha	Shea-Porter
Kanjorski	Musgrave	Sherman
Kaptur	Myrick	Shuler
Kennedy	Napolitano	Shuster
Kildee	Neal (MA)	Simpson
Kilpatrick	Neugebauer	Sires
Kind	Nunes	Skelton
King (NY)	Oberstar	Slaughter
Kingston	Obey	Smith (NE)
Kirk	Oliver	Smith (NJ)
Klein (FL)	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Kline (MN)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Knollenberg	Pascarella	Snyder
Kucinich	Pastor	Solis
Kuhl (NY)	Paul	Space
Lampson	Payne	Speier
Langevin	Pence	Spratt
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Stark
Larson (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Latham	Peterson (PA)	Sutton
LaTourette	Pickering	Tanner
Latta	Pitts	Tauscher
Lee	Platts	Taylor
Levin	Poe	Terry
Lewis (CA)	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Price (GA)	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Tiberi
Loeback	Pryce (OH)	Tierney
Lofgren, Zoe	Radanovich	Towns
Lowey	Rahall	Tsongas
Lucas	Ramstad	Turner
Lynch	Rangel	Udall (CO)
Mahoney (FL)	Reichert	Udall (NM)
Maloney (NY)	Reyes	Upton
Manzullo	Reynolds	Van Hollen
Markey	Richardson	Velázquez
Marshall	Rodriguez	Visclosky
Matheson	Rogers (AL)	Walden (OR)
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Walz (MN)
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Wamp
McCarthy (NY)	Rohrabacher	Wasserman
McCollum (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
McDermott	Roskam	Waters
McGovern	Ross	Watson
McHugh	Rothman	Watt
McKeon	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
McMorris	Royce	Weiner
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Welch (VT)
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Wexler
McNulty	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield (KY)
Meek (FL)	Salazar	Wilson (NM)
Meeks (NY)	Sali	Wilson (OH)
Melancon	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (SC)
Michaud	T.	Wittman (VA)
Miller (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wolf
Miller (MI)	Sarbanes	Woolsey
Miller (NC)	Saxton	Wu
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wynn
Mitchell	Schiff	Yarmuth
Mollohan	Schmidt	Young (FL)
Moore (KS)	Scott (GA)	
Moore (WI)	Scott (VA)	

NOT VOTING—29

□ 1524

Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. DELAULO, Messrs. HASTINGS of Florida, BARROW, CLEAVER, BONNER, HILL, ELLSWORTH, SMITH of Washington, TERRY, CARSON of Indiana, GEORGE MILLER of California, JOHNSON of Georgia, BOYD of Florida, and HINOJOSA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TANCREDO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.